arXiv:quant-ph/0404151v1 27 Apr 2004

Entangled states that cannot reproduce original classical games in their quantum version

Junichi Shimamura,[1, 2, 3] Şahin Kaya Özdemir,[2, 3, 4] Fumiaki Morikoshi,[5] and Nobuyuki Imoto[2, 3, 4, 5]
[1] *Graduate School of Engineering Science, Osaka University,*
1-3 Machikaneyama, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-8531, JAPAN
[2] *SORST Research Team for Interacting Carrier Electronics*
[3]*CREST Research Team for Photonic Quantum Information*
[4]*The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI), Hayama, Kanagawa 240-0193, Japan*
[5]*NTT Basic Research Laboratories, NTT Corporation,*
3-1 Morinosato Wakamiya, Atsugi, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan
(Dated: February 1, 2008)

A model of a quantum version of classical games should reproduce the original classical games in order to be able to make a comparative analysis of quantum and classical effects. We analyze a class of symmetric multipartite entangled states and their effect on the reproducibility of the classical games. We present the necessary and sufficient condition for the reproducibility of the original classical games. Satisfying this condition means that complete orthogonal bases can be constructed from a given multipartite entangled state provided that each party is restricted to two local unitary operators. We prove that most of the states belonging to the class of symmetric states with respect to permutations, including the N-qubit W state, do not satisfy this condition.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 02.50.Le

***a. Introduction*:** Entanglement has become a fundamental ingredient of research in quantum theory and quantum information processing. Recent studies have brought this valuable physical resource into the field of game theory, causing it to emerge as a new field of interest for the quantum information community [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Quantum versions of various classical games have been studied and some results which cannot be seen in the classical versions have been obtained, i.e., shared entanglement between spatially separated parties can help them resolve dilemmas in some of the classical games [1, 9, 10].

The effects of different types of entangled states and their usability in multiplayer multi-strategy games in quantum settings is still an unexplored area of interest. As an attempt to fill this gap, we introduce the reproducibility of the classical version of the game as a criterion to test whether a given multipartite entangled state can be used in quantum versions of classical games or not. Any model of a quantum version of given classical games should include the original classical games as a special case. In other words, the original classical games should be reproduced in the model of a quantum version of the classical games in a certain restricted situation in order to be able to make a comparative analysis of quantum and classical effects in a game. This property makes it possible to investigate what is attainable only in a quantum version.

In classical game theory, a strategic game is defined by $\Gamma = [N, (S_i)_{i\in N}, (\$_i)_{i\in N}]$ where N is the set of players, $S_i = \{s_i^1, s_i^2, \ldots, s_i^m\}$ is the set of pure strategies available to the i-th player with m being the number of strategies, and $\$_i$ is the payoff function for the i-th player. When the strategic game Γ is played with pure strategies, the i-th player chooses one of the strategies from the set S_i. With all players applying a pure strategy (each player chooses only one strategy from the strategy set), the joint strategy of the players is denoted by $\vec{s}_k = (s_1^{l_1}, s_2^{l_2}, \ldots, s_N^{l_N})$ with $l_i = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, m\}$ and $k = \sum_{i=1}^{N}(l_i - 1)m^{i-1}$. Then the i-th player's payoff function is represented by $\$_i(\vec{s}_k)$ when the joint strategy set $\vec{s}_k$ is chosen, i.e., the payoff functions of all players corresponding to the unique joint strategy $\vec{s}_k$ can be represented by $\vec{\$} = (\$_1(\vec{s}_k), \$_2(\vec{s}_k), \ldots, \$_N(\vec{s}_k))$ and it is uniquely determined from the payoff matrix of the game.

So far, most of the studies on quantum versions of classical games have been based on the model proposed by Eisert *et al.* [1]. In this model, the strategy set of the players consists of unitary operators which are applied locally on a shared entangled state by the players. A measurement by a referee on the final state after the application of the operators maps the chosen strategies of the players to their payoff functions. In this model, the two strategies of the players in the original classical game is represented by two unitary operators, $\{\hat{\sigma}_0, i\hat{\sigma}_y\}$.

In this paper, we consider the following model of a quantum version of classical games for N-player-two-strategy games, which includes Eisert *et al.*'s model [11]: (i) A referee prepares an N-qubit entangled state $|\Psi\rangle$ and distributes it among N players, one qubit for each player. (In order to see features intrinsic to quantumness, we focus on a shared entangled state among the players, and exclude the trivial case where a product state is distributed.) (ii) Each player independently and locally applies a unitary operator chosen from the SU(2) set on his qubit, i.e, the i-th player applies $\hat{u}_i$. (We restrict ourselves to the entire set of SU(2) because the global phase is irrelevant). Hence, the combined strategies of all the players is represented by the tensor product of all players' unitary operators as $\hat{x} = \hat{u}_1 \otimes \hat{u}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{u}_N$, which generates the output state $\hat{x} | \Psi \rangle$ to be submitted to the referee. (iii) Upon receiving this final state, the referee makes a projective measurement $\{\Pi_j\}_{j=1}^{2^N}$ which outputs j with probability $\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_j \hat{x} | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | \hat{x}^\dagger]$, and assigns payoffs chosen from the payoff matrix, depending on the measurement outcome j.

In this model, we require that a classical game be reproduced when each player's strategy set is restricted to two unitary operators, $U_i = \{\hat{u}_i^1, \hat{u}_i^2\}$, corresponding to the two pure strategies in the classical game. When the classical game is played in this model, the combined strategy of the players is represented by $\hat{x}_k = \hat{u}_1^{l_1} \otimes \hat{u}_2^{l_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{u}_N^{l_N}$ with $l_i = \{1, 2\}$ and $k = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (l_i - 1) 2^{i-1}$. Thus the output state becomes $| \Phi_k \rangle = \hat{x}_k | \Psi \rangle$ with $k = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^N\}$. In order to assign payoffs uniquely, the referee needs to discriminate all the possible output states $| \Phi_k \rangle$ deterministically, i.e., the projector $\{\Pi_j\}_{j=1}^{2^N}$ has to satisfy $\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_j | \Phi_k \rangle \langle \Phi_k |] = \delta_{jk}$. This can be satisfied if and only if $\langle \Phi_\alpha | \Phi_\beta \rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\forall \alpha, \beta$. Therefore, we can say that an entangled state $| \Psi \rangle$ can be used in this model of quantum version of classical games if and only if there exist two unitary operators $\{\hat{u}_i^1, \hat{u}_i^2\}$ for each player such that the distinguishability condition, $\langle \Phi_\alpha | \Phi_\beta \rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\forall \alpha, \beta$ is satisfied. Otherwise, the players' strategies are mapped to a probability distribution over the entries of the payoff matrix, which implies that the original classical game with pure strategies cannot be reproduced in the quantum game settings.

Any two-qubit pure state satisfies the above distinguishability condition: The Schmidt decomposition of a two-qubit state is $\alpha | 00 \rangle + \beta | 11 \rangle$ with α, β being real. This state satisfies the distinguishability condition if the two unitary operators for two players are chosen as $\{\hat{\sigma}_0, \hat{\sigma}_x\}$ and $\{\hat{\sigma}_0, i\hat{\sigma}_y\}$, respectively. Although Eisert *et al.*'s model was originally proposed for two-player-two-strategy games, it has recently been extended to multi-player-two-strategy games by introducing the GHZ-like state $(| 00 \ldots 0 \rangle + i | 11 \ldots 1 \rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, which satisfies the above condition with the two unitary operators chosen as $\{\hat{\sigma}_0, i\hat{\sigma}_y\}$ for each player [6]. Of course, any state related to this state by local unitary transformations also satisfies the condition. This naturally leads to the question of whether or not other classes of multipartite entangled states can satisfy the distinguishability condition. In other words, we seek for classes of entangled states that can or cannot be used in the quantum versions of classical games in this model.

***b. W state cannot be used*:** The results obtained with the GHZ-like state encourage us to investigate the W state [12] for multi-player games. We, therefore, consider an N-party form of the W state, defined as $|W_N\rangle = |N-1, 1\rangle / \sqrt{N}\, (N \geq 3)$, where $|N-1, 1\rangle$ is a symmetric state with $N-1$ zeros and 1 one, e.g. $|2, 1\rangle = |001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle$. The reduced density operators of any two-party in the state $| W_N \rangle$ are the same, and thus entanglement between any two-party is also the same and the maximum possible amount [13]. On the contrary, in the GHZ-like state there is no bipartite entanglement. Consequently, one might expect that using the state $| W_N \rangle$ can introduce new features into the game. One possibility might be the case where two of the players decide to conspire to make their payoffs as high as possible, exploiting bipartite entanglement shared between them. However, before analyzing these possibilities, one should be sure that when the state $| W_N \rangle$ is used in the quantum scheme, the resultant quantum game should include the original classical game as its subset, that is, the results of the classical game should be reproducible in the quantum scheme. In the following, we consider the distinguishability condition discussed above, for the state $| W_N \rangle$. In other words, we investigate whether there exist two unitary operators $\{\hat{u}_i, \hat{v}_i\}$ for each player such that full orthogonal bases are constructed from the state $| W_N \rangle$ by applying all possible combinations of the two unitary operators.

Let us denote the i-th player's strategy set $U_i = \{\hat{u}_i, \hat{v}_i\}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, N)$ in an N-player game. Since the set of the joint strategies includes 2^N elements, these strategies when acted upon the shared state $| W_N \rangle$ will generate the set of output states $\{|\Phi_1\rangle, |\Phi_2\rangle, \ldots, |\Phi_{2^N}\rangle\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_1\rangle &= (\hat{u}_1 \otimes \hat{u}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{u}_N) \,| W_N \rangle, \\ |\Phi_2\rangle &= (\hat{v}_1 \otimes \hat{u}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{u}_N) \,| W_N \rangle, \\ &\ \vdots \\ |\Phi_{2^N}\rangle &= (\hat{v}_1 \otimes \hat{v}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{v}_N) \,| W_N \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In the following, we prove that there exists no operator set U_i such that

$$\langle \Phi_\alpha | \Phi_\beta \rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in \{1, \ldots, 2^N\}. \tag{2}$$

First, let us consider two states in which the strategies of only one player are different, like $| \Phi_1 \rangle$ and $| \Phi_2 \rangle$. The inner product of these states becomes

$$\langle \Phi_1 \,|\, \Phi_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N} [(N-1) \langle 0 \,| \hat{u}_1^\dagger \hat{v}_1 |\, 0 \rangle + \langle 1 \,| \hat{u}_1^\dagger \hat{v}_1 |\, 1 \rangle]. \tag{3}$$

Since $\hat{u}_1$ and $\hat{v}_1$ are SU(2) operators, so is $\hat{u}_1^\dagger \hat{v}_1$, which can be written as

$$\hat{u}_1^\dagger \hat{v}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ y^* & -x^* \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

with x and y being complex numbers, and $|x|^2 + |y|^2 = 1$. Then, Eq. (3) together with the condition in Eq. (2)

implies

$$\hat{u}_1^\dagger \hat{v}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\phi_1} \\ e^{-i\phi_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

where ϕ_1 is a real number. Indeed, this holds for all $\hat{u}_i^\dagger \hat{v}_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, N)$.

Next, let us consider the inner product of the following two states,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_1\rangle &= (\hat{u}_1 \otimes \hat{u}_2 \otimes \hat{u}_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{u}_N)\,|W_N\rangle, \\ |\Phi_3\rangle &= (\hat{v}_1 \otimes \hat{v}_2 \otimes \hat{u}_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{u}_N)\,|W_N\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

which are different in the strategies of only two players. The inner product of the states becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_1 \,|\, \Phi_3 \rangle &= \frac{1}{N}\left(\langle 01\,| + \langle 10\,|\right)(\hat{u}_1^\dagger \hat{v}_1) \otimes (\hat{u}_2^\dagger \hat{v}_2)\left(|\,01\rangle + |\,10\rangle\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\left(e^{i(\phi_1 - \phi_2)} + e^{-i(\phi_1 - \phi_2)}\right) \\ &= \frac{2}{N}\cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

From the condition in Eq. (2), we obtain $\phi_1 - \phi_2 = \pi/2 + n\pi$ with n being an integer. Similarly, we have $\phi_i - \phi_j = \pi/2 + n\pi$ for all combinations of i and j.

Now let us look at the following three cases,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_i - \phi_j &= \frac{\pi}{2} + n\pi, \\ \phi_j - \phi_k &= \frac{\pi}{2} + n'\pi, \\ \phi_k - \phi_i &= \frac{\pi}{2} + n''\pi, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $i \neq j \neq k$, and n, n', and n'' are integers. The sum of the above three equations gives $\pi/2 = -(n + n' + n'' + 1)\pi$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, there exists no operator set U_i satisfying the condition of Eq. (2). This means that the state $|\,W_N\rangle$ cannot be used [14]. This conclusion is still valid even if a relative phase is added to each term, because the state $|\,W_N\rangle$ with any relative phase can be converted into the state $|\,W_N\rangle$ by local unitary transformations.

***c. Generalization to Dicke states*:** Next, let us consider a more general class of symmetric states $|\,N - m, m\rangle/\sqrt{{}_N C_m}$ with $(N - m)$ zeros and m ones, which are also known as Dicke states [15], where ${}_N C_m$ denotes the binomial coefficient. The state $|\,W_N\rangle$ and the Bell state $(|\,01\rangle + |\,10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ are members of Dicke states, $|\,N - 1, 1\rangle/\sqrt{N}$ and $|\,1, 1\rangle/\sqrt{2}$, respectively. In the following, we will see that almost all Dicke states cannot be used for the model of a quantum version of N-player games as well as the state $|\,W_N\rangle$. Note that the GHZ state, which can be used in the model, are not Dicke states, although they can be represented as superpositions of two Dicke states $|\,N, 0\rangle$ and $|\,0, N\rangle$.

Let us consider the inner product of the two output states, like $|\,\Phi_1\rangle$ and $|\,\Phi_2\rangle$, which differ only in the strategy of one player. The inner product of two such states $\langle \Phi_1 \,|\, \Phi_2 \rangle$ becomes

$$\frac{N - m}{N}\langle 0\,|\hat{u}_i^\dagger \hat{v}_i|\,0\rangle + \frac{m}{N}\langle 1\,|\hat{u}_i^\dagger \hat{v}_i|\,1\rangle. \tag{9}$$

When the numbers of zeros and ones are different, i.e., $m \neq N/2$, the coefficients of $\langle 0\,|\hat{u}_i^\dagger \hat{v}_i|\,0\rangle$ and $\langle 1\,|\hat{u}_i^\dagger \hat{v}_i|\,1\rangle$ are different as in Eq. (3). Thus, as in the case of the state $|\,W_N\rangle$, the diagonal elements of $\hat{u}_i^\dagger \hat{v}_i$ are zeros as in Eq. (5). Furthermore, comparing the two output states in which the strategies of only two players are different, we end up with the same contradiction as in Eq. (8). Therefore, we conclude that the class of Dicke states with unequal numbers of zeros and ones ($|\,W_N\rangle$ is a member of this class of states) cannot be used in quantum versions of classical games.

On the other hand, for the Dicke states which contain the same numbers of zeros and ones, i.e., $|\,N/2, N/2\rangle$ with an even number N (the normalization factor is omitted hereafter), we find that all but $|\,1, 1\rangle$ and $|\,2, 2\rangle$ cannot be used. In the case of $|\,2, 2\rangle$, an example of the four players' operators available for the game is $\hat{u}_1 = \hat{u}_2 = \hat{u}_3 = \hat{u}_4 = \hat{\sigma}_0$, $\hat{v}_1 = \hat{v}_2 = \hat{v}_3 = (\sqrt{2}\hat{\sigma}_z + \hat{\sigma}_x)/\sqrt{3}$, and $\hat{v}_4 = \hat{\sigma}_y$.

Next, we prove that the states $|\,N/2, N/2\rangle$ $(N \geq 6)$ cannot be used in quantum versions of classical games by showing that such states cannot satisfy the condition in Eq. (2). Since $m = N/2$, the inner product in Eq. (9) gives

$$\hat{u}_i^\dagger \hat{v}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_i & e^{i\phi_i}\sin\theta_i \\ e^{-i\phi_i}\sin\theta_i & -\cos\theta_i \end{pmatrix} \tag{10}$$

where θ_i and ϕ_i are real numbers. Imposing the condition in Eq. (2) on two output states which differ only in the strategies of two players, and using Eq. (10), we obtain

$$\cos\theta_i \cos\theta_j = \frac{N}{2}\cos\left(\phi_i - \phi_j\right)\sin\theta_i \sin\theta_j. \tag{11}$$

Similarly, we consider the inner product of two output states in which the strategies of only four players are different. Together with Eqs. (10) and (11), the necessary condition of Eq. (2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{24}{N(N-2)}\cos\theta_i \cos\theta_j \cos\theta_k \cos\theta_l \\ &\quad = \left[\cos\beta_1 + \cos\beta_2 + \cos\beta_3\right]\sin\theta_i \sin\theta_j \sin\theta_k \sin\theta_l, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\beta_1 = \phi_i + \phi_j - \phi_k - \phi_l$, $\beta_2 = \phi_i - \phi_j + \phi_k - \phi_l$ and $\beta_3 = \phi_i - \phi_j - \phi_k + \phi_l$. In the following, we prove that these states cannot be used by showing a contradiction between Eqs. (10) - (12):

(i) $\theta_i \neq n\pi$ for $\forall i$: Assume there exists $i = i_0$ such that $\theta_i = n\pi$. Then Eq. (11) implies $\theta_j = \pi/2 + n'\pi$ for $\forall j \neq i_0$. For any $j, k \neq i_0$, substituting $\theta_{j,k} = \pi/2 + n'\pi$ into Eq. (11) yields $\phi_j - \phi_k = \pi/2 + m\pi$. These equations imply a contradiction as in Eq. (8). Therefore θ_i cannot be $n\pi$ for $\forall i$.

(ii) $\theta_i \neq \pi/2 + n\pi$ for $\forall i$: Take an index $i = i_0$ such that $\theta_i = \pi/2 + n\pi$. Then Eq. (11) implies two solutions $\theta_j = n\pi$, which is already ruled out in (i), and $\phi_{i_0} - \phi_j = \pi/2 + m\pi$, for $\forall j \neq i_0$. Then for $\forall j, k \neq i_0$, we find $\phi_j - \phi_k = \pi + m'\pi$. Substituting this in Eq. (11) gives $\pm(N/2)\sin\theta_j \sin\theta_k = \cos\theta_j \cos\theta_k$. Using these equalities in Eq. (12) together with $\theta_i \neq n\pi$, we find $6N/(N-2) = \pm[\cos\beta_1 + \cos\beta_2 + \cos\beta_3]$. This implies a contradiction because while the right hand side lies in the range $[-3, 3]$, the left hand side is greater then 6 as $N \geq 6$. Therefore θ_i cannot be $\neq \pi/2 + n\pi$ for $\forall i$.

Applying (i) and (ii) to Eqs.(11) and (12) completes the proof: Let us take four different indices i, j, k and l. Multiplying two equations obtained from Eq. (11) for the index pairs (i, j) and (k, l) yields $\cos\theta_i \cos\theta_j \cos\theta_k \cos\theta_l = (N^2/4)[\cos(\phi_i - \phi_j)\cos(\phi_k - \phi_l)]\sin\theta_i \sin\theta_j \sin\theta_k \sin\theta_l$. Comparison of these equations for different pairs of the indices, such as (i, k) and (j, l), together with the condition $\theta_{i,j,k,l} \neq n\pi$ reveals $\cos(\phi_i - \phi_j)\cos(\phi_k - \phi_l) = \cos(\phi_i - \phi_k)\cos(\phi_j - \phi_l) = \cos(\phi_i - \phi_l)\cos(\phi_j - \phi_k)$. Then the trigonometric identity $2\cos a \cos b = \cos(a + b) + \cos(a - b)$ leads to $\cos\beta_1 = \cos\beta_2 = \cos\beta_3$. From the first equation we have $\beta_1 = \mp\beta_2 + 2m\pi$. Now let us consider the first case $\beta_1 = \beta_2 + 2m\pi$, which is simplified to $\phi_j - \phi_k = m\pi$. From Eqs. (11) and (12), we have $(2N/(N-2))\cos(\phi_i - \phi_l)\cos(\phi_j - \phi_k) = \cos\beta_1$. Substituting $\phi_j - \phi_k = m\pi$ in both sides of the equation, we obtain $\pm(2N/(N-2))\cos(\phi_i - \phi_l) = \cos(\phi_i - \phi_l)$. Since $N \geq 6$, this equation is satisfied only if $\phi_i - \phi_l = \pi/2 + m'\pi$. Substituting this in Eq. (11) yields $\theta_i = \pi/2 + n'\pi$ or $\theta_l = \pi/2 + n'\pi$, which contradicts the fact proven in (ii) that $\theta_i \neq \pi/2 + n\pi$ for $\forall i$. It is easily seen that the same argument holds for the case $\beta_1 = -\beta_2 + 2m\pi$. This completes the proof that the state $|\,N/2, N/2\rangle$ for $(N \geq 6)$ cannot be used in quantum versions of classical games in this specific model.

***d. Conclusion*:** We have investigated whether any multipartite entangled states can be used in our model of a quantum version of classical games, which includes Eisert *et al.*'s model. We have presented the necessary and sufficient condition for the reproducibility of classical games in this model. This study reveals that none of the Dicke states of the form $|\,N - m, m\rangle$, except $|\,1, 1\rangle$ and $|\,2, 2\rangle$, can satisfy this condition. Our argument on the reproducibility of classical games can be rephrased as the possibility of constructing complete orthogonal bases from an initial state by applying all possible combinations of two local unitary operations on each qubit. It is naturally possible to construct the bases from N-qubit product states. In entangled states, however, this is not always true, i.e., while this task is possible starting with an N-qubit GHZ state $(|\,00\ldots0\rangle + |\,11\ldots1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, it is impossible when the N-qubit state is the state $|\,W_N\rangle$. This is another difference in the properties of the GHZ and the W state. We think our analysis might be useful in understanding the nature of multipartite entanglement in quantum information processing. The study on how this property of entanglement is related to other quantum information processing tasks remains as a subject to be discussed further.

The authors thank M. Koashi for helpful discussions and critical reading of the manuscript, and T. Yamamoto and J. Soderholm for their warm support during this research. This work is partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (15300079) by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) and by the Telecommunications Advancement Organization of Japan (TAO) .

References

---

[1] J. Eisert, M. Wilkens, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3077 (1999).

[2] D. A. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1052 (1999).

[3] S. J. van Enk and R. Pike, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 024306 (2002).

[4] J. Du, H. Li, X. Xu, M. Shi, J. Wu, X. Zhou, and R. Han, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 137902 (2002).

[5] N. F. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 020302 (2001).

[6] S. C. Benjamin and P. M. Hayden, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 030301 (2001).

[7] A. Iqbal and A. H. Toor, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052328 (2002).

[8] C. F. Lee and N. F. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 022311 (2003).

[9] Ş. K. Özdemir, J. Shimamura, F. Morikoshi, and N. Imoto, quant-ph/0311074.

[10] J. Shimamura, Ş. K. Özdemir, F. Morikoshi, and N. Imoto, quant-ph/0311104.

[11] Eisert *et al.*'s model requires that an operator $\hat{J}$, which generates an enetangled state, and all possible combinations of classical pure strategies be commutative. If it holds, then all possible output states are distinguishable, which means the condition required in our model is satisfied. However, the converse is not always true.

[12] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).

[13] M. Koashi, V. Bužek, and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 050302 (2000).

[14] Y-J Han *et al.*, Phys. Lett. A **295**, 61 (2002) has studied three-person prisoner's dilemma with an emphasis on the comparison of the W and the GHZ states using a similar model. However, in their approach, they do not require the reproducibility of the classical game in the quantum version. When they apply the quantum operators corresponding to the classical strategies to these initial states, while the payoffs delivered to the players are unique entries from the classical payoff table for GHZ state (original classical game results are reproduced), the payoffs become a probability distribution over the entries of the

payoff matrix for W state (classical game results are not reproduced).

[15] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1995).